

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

SAM REDDYE,

Plaintiff,

v.

**CITY OF ASTORIA; and OFFICER
JASON ROBINSON,**

Defendants.

Case No. 3:22-cv-01569-AR

ORDER ADOPTING F&R

Jina L. Clark, Clark Law and Associates, LLC, 6501 SW Macadam Ave. Suite E, Portland, OR 97239. Attorney for Plaintiff.

Andrew D. Campbell, Heltzel Williams, PC, P.O. Box 1048, Salem, OR 97308. Attorney for Defendants.

IMMERGUT, District Judge.

On May 30, 2025, Magistrate Judge Armistead issued his Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”), ECF 47. The F&R recommends that this Court deny Defendants’ request for an award of costs, ECF 42. No party filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), as amended, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.”

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party objects to a magistrate judge’s F&R, “the court shall make a

de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* But the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the F&R that are not objected to. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). Nevertheless, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge, *sua sponte*” whether de novo or under another standard. *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154.

No party having filed objections, this Court has reviewed the F&R and accepts Judge Armistead’s conclusions. The F&R, ECF 47, is adopted in full. Defendants’ Bill of Costs, ECF 42, is DENIED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 17th day of June, 2025.

/s/ Karin J. Immergut
Karin J. Immergut
United States District Judge